

## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-27, 29-45 and 47-50 remain pending herein.

1. Examiner Derrington is thanked for courtesies extended during a telephonic interview on May 12, 2003, with applicant's undersigned attorney. In this regard, the amendments to the present claims herein were generally discussed. As tentatively agreed, the amendment herein overcome the rejections contained in the Office Action dated January 13, 2003, discussed in more detail below.

2. Claims 1-2, 13-14, 18-22, 29-34, 37, 42-43,45 and 47-50 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph. This rejection is overcome in view of the incorporation of the subject matter of Claim 3 into the independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Claim 1-12, 15-18, 32-35, 42-45 and 47-49 were rejected under section 102/Section 103 over Enck, et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, the presently claimed invention is drawn to methods for reducing resistivity for forming aluminum nitride bodies. According to the claimed invention, the present method combines important features of provision of an aluminum nitride body consisting essentially of aluminum nitride, and having a relative density greater than about 98% of theoretical density. In this regard, as explained in detail in the Amendment filed October 25, 2002, the "consisting essentially of" transitional language precludes addition of materials such as sintering aids that negatively impact the characteristics of the claimed invention, such as corrosion resistance. See page 3, first two paragraphs of the response filed October 25, 2002.

In this regard, the applied prior art reference Enck, et al. disclose a process for forming an aluminum nitride body relying upon sintering aids to form bodies having a density on the order of 90% or higher, preferably greater than 95% or higher. Enck, et al. fail to disclose (or even remotely suggest) elimination of sintering aids, while still achieving desirably high densities such as greater than about 98% of theoretical density as presently claimed.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, it was tentatively agreed that the amendments herein, for at least the foregoing reasons, overcome the rejection based upon Enck, et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection based upon Enck, et al. is respectfully requested.


4. Claims 13-14, 19-31, 36-41 and 50 were rejected under Section 103 over Enck, et al. in further view of Kurokawa, et al. or Fukushima, et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the additional cited secondary references fail to overcome the deficiencies of Enck, et al., discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as well.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner Derrington is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Should Examiner Derrington deem that any further action by the applicant would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, Examiner Derrington is requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.: EV 335896484 US

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey S. Abel, Reg. No. 36,079  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, LLP  
P.O. Box 29567  
Austin, Texas 78755-9567  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5452 (fax)